

suggestion by the Examiner in the interview of May 10, 2000. No new matter has been introduced thereby. Note that Claims 40-62 substantially parallel cancelled Claims 18-39.

A typographical error in the specification has been corrected.

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested.

Claims 40-62 are in the case.

The interview kindly granted by the Examiner, Mr. Paulraj, also attended by Primary Examiner, Mr. Nakarani, on May 10, 2000 is herewith acknowledged with appreciation. It served to materially advance the prosecution of the case by clarifying the issue. For reasons as pointed out and discussed at said interview and in view of the amendment to the claims, the Examiner stated that he will reconsider his position and that such amendment may overcome the rejections based on the prior art of record.

The invention relates to a glass-free motor vehicle window, which is at least partly transparent and of optical quality equivalent to a window, which comprises:

- a.) a plastic layer having a thickness of 5 to 10 mm,
- b.) at least one skin layer of a plastic film having a thickness of 10 to 100 µm coated on said plastic layer, and
- c.) a scratch-resistant layer having a thickness of 1 to 10 µm supported by said plastic film,

as well as to a process for its preparation.

With regard to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Motter, Oliver, and Tatebayashi, as well as under 35 U.S.C. §103 over

Tatebayashi in view of Pier, these rejections clearly are no longer viable in view of the amendment to the claims.

Specifically, the only reference by Motter to a glass-free motor vehicle window is its disclosure at column 1, line 38, broadly referring to an all-plastic structure. Its entire disclosure and teaching, otherwise, is directed to a glass window for an automobile. Such all inclusive and prophetic disclosure by Motter certainly neither teaches, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102, nor even makes obvious, even if the rejection is considered to have been made under 35 U.S.C. §103, a glass-free motor vehicle window as particularly defined by the claims having specific thicknesses of particular layers as defined.

Thus, essential to the present invention is that the plastic layer a.) has a thickness of 5 to 10 mm, the window being glass-free. Contrariwise, in the window of Motter, the maximum thickness of the corresponding glass layer is about $\frac{1}{2}$ of the thickness of plastic layer a.) Certainly, the disclosure of Motter, does not teach, nor make obvious the plastic layer having a thickness at least about twice the thickness of the corresponding glass layer in the window of Motter. Such thickness of plastic layer a.) ensures sufficient mechanical properties, particularly in view of its use as a car body part, as well as possessing high optical quality. Note that the "thick" layer 19 of Figure 4 has a thickness of only 381 microns. Such thickness of a plastic layer would not provide the required mechanical properties, i.e., being relatively stiff and of relatively high flexural strength.

With regard to Oliver, it is even less relevant. It relates to a solar control window film, its layers similarly not having thicknesses as so particularly called for by the claims. The same is true for Tatebayashi, its structure also not being of a vehicle window of optical quality as so specifically called for by the claims. Note that Bier is relied upon only for

obviousness of a subsidiary claimed feature and, as such does not remedy the basic inadequacy of Tatebayashi to make obvious Applicants' discovery.

The Examiner at said interview thus stated that he will reconsider his position towards overcoming the cited prior art, such now being requested.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 is requested.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 32 under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112, the typographical error "aid" has been corrected to --said-- in corresponding Claim 54.

As to the rejection of the claims under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112, they have been amended in a manner believed to obviate this rejection, consistent with the kind suggestions made by the Examiner at said interview.

Should any further amendments to the claims be considered necessary by the Examiner, he is requested to telephonically contact the undersigned so that mutually agreeable language may be arrived at.

Withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, thus is requested.

It is submitted that the claims define a patentable invention. Their allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 24,618

Samuel H. Blech
Registration No. 32,082



22850

(703) 413-3000
Fax #: (703) 413-2220
SHB/law

I:\atty\SHB\12470796-AM.WPD